

EXAMINER INTERVIEW SUMMARY

On March 12, 2004, Applicants' attorney, Wagner, Murabito & Hao, LLP, and Examiner Santiago conducted a telephone conference. During the telephone conference, Applicants' attorney and Examiner Santiago discussed the case prosecution including the Claims and the cited art, as well as proposed amendments. Applicants sincerely thank Examiner Santiago for the telephone conference.

REMARKS

Claims 36, 37, 39-44 and 52-58 are pending in the Application. Claims 36, 42, 53 and 57 are amended herein. No new matter is added as a result of the claim amendments.

Claim Objections

Claim 57 is herein amended to overcome the Objections. Applicants thank the Examiner for the suggested amendments.

35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejection

Rejection of Claim 39 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 is moot, as amended Claim 36 now provides sufficient antecedent basis for the term “said electrons.”

35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) Rejections

Claims 36, 37, 39, 40, 42 and 43, 44, 52 and 55-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as allegedly being anticipated by Taylor, et al. (“Taylor,” US 5,536,993). Applicants have reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submit that the present invention as recited in Claims 36, 37, 39, 40, 42 and 43, 44, 52 and 55-57 is not anticipated by Taylor.

Applicants respectfully assert that Taylor does not teach, suggest or disclose a “barrier layer... configured to prevent substantial penetration of

electrons” as recited by Independent Claim 36. Likewise, Taylor is silent with respect to preventing “contaminants due to electron bombardment” from migrating “from a cathode structure into an active region of said field emission display device” as recited by Independent Claim 53.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 36 and 53 overcome the basis for rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as these claims are not anticipated by Taylor, and respectfully solicit allowance of these Claims.

Claims 37, 39, 40, 42 and 43 depend from Claim 36. Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of these Claims as they depend from an allowable base claim.

Claims 54 – 58 depend from Claim 53. Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of these Claims as they depend from an allowable base claim.

35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) Rejections

Claims 52 and 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Taylor, et al. (“Taylor,” US 5,536,993) in view of Kawate, et al. (“Kawate,” US 5,770,918). Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the present invention as recited in Claims 52 and 54 is not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Taylor in view of Kawate.

The Office Action utilizes Kawate to teach soda-lime glass (high sodium content) for the use of substrates in display devices. In the background of the

present Application, Applicants clearly identify the desirability “to use inexpensive high sodium glass for the cathode substrate structure (page 5 lines 9 –11).”

Additionally, the present Application clearly identifies a significant drawback to such use of high sodium glass under the conventional art: “Electron bombardment of such inexpensive high-sodium glass causes unwanted migration of contaminants... from the cathode substrate structure into the active region of the (FED). Such migration of contaminants can result in harmful contamination of sensitive device elements... (page 5 lines 11 – 15).”

Thus, combining Taylor with Kawate teaches an undesirable outcome that is solved by embodiments in accordance with the present invention. Consequently, the combination of Taylor and Kawate actually teaches away from the present invention.

Further, both Taylor and Kawate are silent as to means to mitigate such migration or contamination.

For these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 52 and 54 overcome the basis for rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as these claims are not rendered obvious by Taylor in view of Kawate, and respectfully solicit allowance of these Claims.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejected Claims.

Based on the arguments presented above, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 36, 37, 39-44 and 52-58 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of these Claims.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Date: 3/15/04

John P. Wagner
Reg. No. 35,398

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, California 95113
(408) 938-9060